



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,562	02/12/2004	Donald R. Loveday	1999U027.RE.US	1101

7590 02/02/2006

Univation Technologies LLC
Suite 1950
5555 San Felipe
Houston, TX 77056

EXAMINER

CHEUNG, WILLIAM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1713

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/777,562	Applicant(s) LOVEDAY ET AL.	
	Examiner William K. Cheung	Art Unit 1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Non-Compliance

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to identify at least one error which is relied upon to support the reissue application. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414. A new declaration is needed.

Applicants' argument filed November 30, 2005 has been fully considered, and the examiner finds it not persuasive because applicants fail to recognize that oath/declaration fails to point out specifically where in the prior art (with column and lines indicated) is considered anticipatory to the instant application.

2. Regarding new claims 16-45, applicants are required to point out the differences between the new claims and the original sets of patented claims. If a claim is amended during reissue prosecution, a parenthetical expression "(amended)," "twice amended"," etc., should follow the original claim number. 37 CFR 1.173 (b)(2). Alternatively, applicant may effectively re-write a claim by presenting it as a new (fully underlined) claim with a new claim number, and canceling the old claim. Brackets and underlining are to be used to reflect only those changes in the text from the original patented text and not from any previous amendment in the reissue application 37 CFR 1.173(g).

3. Regarding the amendment on specification (col. 7, line 39 to col. 8, line 67; col. 9, line 13-43; col. 10, line 8-31; col. 10, line 38-67; col. 11, line 25-46), the amendment to change "M" to "M'", the examiner cannot find the proper support for the change. As written in the original specification, the M cited in Formula I and II (col. 4, line 15-33) are identical to the M cited structure I (col. 7, line 43). There is not an indication that the M of Formula I and II and the M of structure III can be different. Therefore, the recitation "M'" is considered new matter because "M'" is not supported by the original specification.

4. Regarding claims 16, 17, 20, 33-38, 42, 44, 45, the recitation "M'" is considered new matter because "M'" is not supported by the original specification. As written in the original specification, the M cited in Formula I and II (col. 4, line 15-33) are identical to the M cited structure III (col. 7, line 43). There is not an indication that the M of Formula I and II and the M of structure III can be different.

5. Regarding new claims 16-45, applicants are required to indicate how these new claims are different from the original set of the patented claims 1-15, and indicate how these changes are made to correct error without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant.

6. Claims 1-45 are objected In view of the non-compliance issues set forth above.

7. Under 37 CFR 1.176 permits the examiner to make a requirement for restriction. Where a restriction requirement is made, the original patent claims will be held to be constructively elected. (See MPEP 1450) The invention of claims 1-45 are considered patentably distinct from the patented claims 1-15 and is considered a non-elected subject matter of patented invention of claims 1-15. The invention of instant claims 1-45 is drawn to the preparation of emulsion or a suspension, classified as 524/800 while the patented claims 1-15 are drawn to an invention classified in 526/161.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

Art Unit: 1713

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


William K. Cheung, Ph. D.

Primary Patent Examiner

**WILLIAM K. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

January 26, 2006